NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER,

AND

WASHINGTON ADVERTISER.

VOL. VI. WASHINGTON CITY, PRINTED BY SAMUEL HARRISON SMITH, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. No. DCCCLXIV.

FIVE DOLLARS PER ANNUM. WEDNESDAY, APRIL 23, 1806. *PAID IN ADVANCE.*

(By Authority.)

AN ACT
Concerning Markets.

BE *it enacted by the First and Second Chambers of the City Council of Washington,* That after the first day of May next, it shall not be lawful to use any steelyard, at any of the markets in the city of Washington, and all provisions of every kind sold by weight shall be weighed by weights regulated and stamped by the sealer of weights and measures, and if any person shall be guilty of selling by steelyards or patent balances, or by scales falsely balanced, he or she shall forfeit such steelyards, patent balances or scales, and shall pay the sum of five dollars for every such offence, to be recovered before a justice of the peace for Washington county, one half to the use of the corporation, the other half to the use of the informer.

SEC. 2. Be it further enacted, That the mayor be authorised to dispose of the patent balances now in use at the market houses, and with the proceeds thereof to purchase necessary scales and weights, and if the proceeds arising from sales of the said patent balances shall be insufficient to purchase the scales and weights as aforesaid, he is hereby authorised to draw on the Treasurer for the said purpose, for a sum not exceeding one hundred dollars.

JNO. DEMPSIE, *President,*
First Chamber of the city council of Washington.

SAML. HAMILTON, *President,*
Second Chamber of the city council of Washington,

APPROVED, MARCH, 29th, 1806.

ROBERT BRENT, MAYOR.

Test THOS. HERTY, SEC'Y.

CONGRESS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, MARCH 11.

DEBATE
On Mr. GREGG's Resolution.

Mr. G. W. Campbell's Speech, (CONCLUDED.)

I will now submit a few remarks with regard to the effects of such a measure on the agricultural interest of this country. It will here be observed, that no proposition has been made that goes to restrict our exports. They will of course continue to seek the best markets, and our produce will find its way to G. Britain as usual. I admit, however, that commerce and agriculture are so intimately connected, that you cannot give a dangerous blow to the one, without its being felt by the other—but when this is admitted to be the case, it furnishes the strongest ground for extending protection to commerce, least the agricultural interest should suffer, in consequence of the wound given your commerce. I am also willing to admit it probable, if we prohibit the introduction of British manufactures into this country, it may, in some degree, reduce the price of our produce that goes to G. Britain, but not to such an extent as to be seriously felt. It is also true that G. Britain now receives the greatest part of the staple articles, cotton and tobacco, exported from the southern and western states. But should the proposed measure be adopted, she will stand in as much need of cotton as she now does. Her manufactures cannot be carried on without the raw materials, and she cannot procure a sufficiency of this article from any other quarter. This interdiction cannot, therefore, affect the price of cotton—or if it should, it must be in a very small degree indeed. I am not, however, for interdicting the importation from G. Britain of cotton manufactures, because I believe it would be difficult to obtain them at other markets. This will remove the greatest objection that has been stated, on this subject, by the gentleman from Georgia—as G. Britain will still continue to have the same demand for this article. With regard to tobacco, its price cannot be materially affected by this measure—it may perhaps in small degree, as their merchants will not be able to exchange their manufactures for it—but this cannot be such as to be sensibly felt. I cannot therefore consider the objections made to adopting such a measure, on the ground of its injurious effects on the agricultural interest, as well founded. I conceive in the present state of our affairs, the only way in which we can secure and promote the interest of agriculture, is to protect our commerce. But we are asked, if by this measure, we can expect to produce any considerable effect upon a powerful nation without its producing some re-action on ourselves. I answer we must expect, in some degree, to be affected by it—and I believe the American people are prepared to suffer some inconveniencies to obtain redress. They do not expect when measures are taken to vindicate their rights to be permitted to repose at perfect ease. No nation can be in such a situation, as to enable her to act effectively on another power, so as to bring her to terms, without feeling in some degree, herself, the re-action of the measures she may adopt. Such a state of things is not to be expected. If this were the case, there would be no necessity to appeal to the public voice, the national feeling on such occasions. You might adopt any measure you deemed proper, to obtain your object, without consulting the sense of the nation, if the public at large were to be in no manner affected thereby. But the people of America sensibly feel the indignity offered to their country, and are as ready to make sacrifices to obtain redress, as the merchants. When I have said this much, and am willing to go this far—yet I am not disposed to support the mercantile interest to any extravagant extent to which our trade may be carried. I am not disposed to protect our merchants in covering enemy's property—as we have agreed to relinquish the principle, that *a neutral flag shall make neutral property,* I am not now disposed to resume it; and insist on its being observed, though I believe we never ought to have abandoned it, so long as we continued a commercial nation. If therefore any of our merchants are engaged in such trade, in covering enemy's property, let G. Britain seize and condemn their vessels. This she may do—but let not the innocent suffer with the guilty. I beg leave, Mr. Chairman, to make a few remarks on this subject as it respects other nations; we are told, you must not engage in the colonial trade to France or her allies, because you thereby assist the enemies of G. Britain. If this principle be allowed, let me ask what will France say? She will tell you, you shall not trade in the colonial productions of Great Britain, because you will thereby give aid and assistance to her, the enemy of France—and would not this have more than the appearance of justice in it? Would it not be a fair position? Has not France the same right with Great Britain to say, you shall not furnish supplies to her enemies? And thus you would be stript of the whole of the colonial trade. But you are asked, if, when you adopt this resolution, you are prepared to contend with the navy of G. Britain. I was, sir, sorry to hear this remark introduced on this occasion. To hear it said, when you are about making a regulation merely commercial, to direct the affairs of your own country—if you adopt such measures G. Britain will make war upon you—will at a single stroke, sweep all your vessels from the ocean! To hear the power of that nation magnified, and her warlike achievements painted in the highest colours, as if to awe, and intimidate your own country! Is it indeed, sir, come to this, that we shall not be permitted to wear a coat, the cloth of which is not made in G. Britain? Shall we not determine for ourselves, without consulting any other nation with regard to the clothes we shall wear, or the food or liquors we shall consume? If the crisis has arrived, at which we are *afraid* to decide on those points without having *a special regard to the good pleasure* of G. Britain—I say, in the name of God, let us resign our independence—return again to the degraded state of colonies, and only enquire under whose wings we shall place ourselves for protection. But suppose the power of that nation is so great and formidable, (as it has been repeatedly represented by gentlemen) that you are not to take a step without consulting her interest, least you should offend her. When, let me ask, will this power be diminished? When will the obstacle be removed? She has now nearly eight hundred ships of war on the ocean—in what degree must they be diminished, before you will dare to take the first step in vindication of your violated rights? Or suppose her navy should be increased, in a few years, to a 1000 or 1500 ships of war, shall we shrink from defending our rights, in proportion to this encrease of her navy? I am not, sir, willing to sanction such a doctrine. However powerful she may be, *right* is still the same, and ought to be maintained inviolate. You have been told triumphantly, that G. Britain is fighting the battles of the world. This is a declaration which, I presume, ought not to be made within these walls. It is not with us to determine whether she is or is not fighting the battles of the world. On this point we are not to legislate. We are a neutral nation, and as such ought not to affect a partiality for either France or G. Britain. I will not, on this occasion, change my vote, on the ground that G. Britain is fighting the battles of the world—or that Bonaparte is conquering it. The moment it shall become necessary for us to take part in the war, then, and not till then, I shall be willing to declare on which side we ought to enlist this nation; but *while at peace* it is neither the right nor the duty of a neutral power to determine which of those nations engaged in war has justice on her side. I conceive we are bound to do equal justice to the one as to the other, and not wilfully to aid either to the prejudice of the other. It has also been stated on this floor that your territory has been violated, and your frontiers invaded by Spain; and that you ought to avenge these wrongs, before you take measures to protect your commerce. It is true, sir, some unjustifiable acts have been done, on our southern and western frontiers by Spanish subjects, and perhaps by Spanish agents. But it does not appear those acts were authorised or sanctioned by their government. So far as has come to our knowledge, from the documents on your tables and from the best information that has been obtained, (& the House are possessed of the same information,) there have been no aggressions or violations of territorial right, committed within that portion of the territory of the U. S. of which we have taken actual possession, or on our citizens within the same, under the acknowledged authority of the Spanish government; on the contrary her officers have explicitly disavowed the aggressions complained of. If the subjects of Spain, and American citizens, have crossed the line of demarkation, alternately, and committed outrages on the territories of each power without authority from their respective governments (which it is believed was the case,) it is a proper subject for judicial investigation, or for amicable adjustment, by the agents of the two governments, but not a just cause of war, so long as those acts are disavowed by the respective goverments. There is, therefore, no ground for the assertion, that we have tamely submitted to the aggressions and inroads of Spain upon our territory. With regard to the depredations stated to have been committed on our commerce by the cruizers of France and Spain, they are of a nature altogether different from those committed by G. Britain. The former governments have not sanctioned the conduct of their cruizers in those late cases complained of. They have not authorised them by formal *instructions* to prey upon our commerce, and seize our vessels engaged in a lawful trade; nor have they introduced into the law of nations a *new principle,* suited to the present circumstances, to justify aggressions. Since the unauthorised captures, made by the cruisers of those two governments, which have for a considerable time been in a train of amicable settlement, there is not a case that has come to our knowledge, in which the admiralty courts of France and Spain, in deciding on captures made of American property, have assumed and acted upon a principle contrary to the law of nations, to justify the condemnation of such property, and in which the same was afterwards sanctioned by either of those governments. On the contrary it is well known, and so declared by her minister here, that Spain has issued orders to her cruizers to respect the American flag. What foundation, therefore, is there for the declaration of gentlemen, that you have cringed and shrunk from the contest with France and Spain, and now wish to *bully* G. Britain? There is none, sir. We have not tamely submitted to injury or insult from those quarters, nor have we deserted the rights of our country. And when the whole proceedings, which have taken place during the present session shall be made public, (which I hope may soon take place) the American people will justify and applaud our conduct, and they will also judge who were disposed to resign *their* rights, and to submit to national insult and injury.

It has, Mr. Chairman, been observed by a gentleman from New-York (Mr. Masters,) that national animosity produced the resolution before you. I regret that such an idea should be expressed on this floor. I know of no such animosity, but I believe on the contrary if a national partiality exists in this country, it is, in favor of G. Britain; not that I believe such partiality criminal; but G. Britain being the parent country; speaking the same language with ourselves, and so many of her subjects becoming citizens of this country, there is naturally felt a degree of attachment towards the people of that nation. If these feelings do not go too far, they are laudable; but in regard to a national animosity towards to G. Britain, I do not believe it exists in this country, at least to any considerable extent. If gentlemen mean that this animosity exist against tyranny, I hope it will eternally exist, so long as its cause exists.

But, Mr. Chairman, I hope we shall not cherish animosity against France, any more than against G. Britain. Nor do I wish us to cherish partiality for either. There was, I believe, sir, a time, when the people of this country felt a generous impulse in favor of the French nation. The flame of liberty that issued from the bosom of America, during her revolution, had kindled up anew in France, and promised for a while to illuminate the whole world. The American people rejoiced at the prospect, and felt a generous sentiment of enthusiasm towards those who appeared to be advocating the cause of liberty and the freedom of man. But I am not prepared to say, that this flame has continued to burn, or that the expectations it created have been realised; but I may, I presume say, there is no ground to believe, that this nation entertains a criminal animosity against or partiality for either G. Britain or France. The same gentleman has observed what I admit, is too true, that G. Britain governs the commerce of the world. This, however, is the strongest reason that could be advanced, against a tame submission to every act of aggression which that government may choose to commit on your commerce, unless, indeed, you are willing to acknowledge a national pusillanimity, and an inability to resist injury. If we are unable to oppose G. Britain on the ocean, and she will persist in her unjust violation of our rights; let us withdraw from all connexions with her—confine ourselves within the limits of our own territory, and live independent of her luxuries and her commerce on the productions and manufactures of our own country.

I have one or two remarks to make on an observation of a gentleman from Georgia. That gentleman says, that we are happy beyond all example. I admit the truth of this remark; but is it the way to continue so; to submit to every insult, and cringe to every injury? to shrink from resistance, and estimate the value of our rights by the strength of the British navy; but in an *inverse ratio.* If we look back to the rise of our liberty, we shall find it sprung from a manly resistance against tyranny. It is our duty, in my opinion, to make the like resistance now; to imitate the conduct of our forefather from whose exertions we derived our independence. But then it is repeated by the same gentleman, that this measure will be considered by G. Britain as a cause of war. This idea seems to be so deeply fixed in the minds of gentlemen, that they seem to see that nation take flame, and make war the moment you touch her *sacred interest,* her manufactures. I am still, however, unable to discover upon what ground this measure can be considered a cause of war. It is simply a commercial regulation—and you might as well be told, she would consider a law regulating your ordinary internal concerns, a cause of war. It may here be proper to notice one circumstance *of some singularity* attending the present discussion. Some gentlemen opposed to this resolution, have expressed their willingness to do something,—to adopt a measure less energetic than this is.—Yet all their arguments are bottomed on the same principle, and are equally hostile to any effective measure that can be devised, as they are to that before you. If Great Britain has a right to consider a total prohibition of her merchandise into this country, a cause of war, she has the same right to consider a partial prohibition so. The principle is the same—the only difference is in degree—or in regard to the quantum of merchandize to be affected by the measure. Though, therefore, my vote may agree with the votes of those gentlemen on this resolution, it will be given for very different reasons from those they have assigned. I shall vote against it, because, (though I am clearly of opinion,) we have a right to adopt it without giving just cause of war, yet I consider it more advisable, at this time, to adopt a measure that will prove less injurious to our own interest, and may be equally effective in coercing Great Britain to do us justice.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Williams) appeared, really, to think, that war had already been declared—that Great Britain had landed her troops on our shores, and that our people were flying to arms or escaping to the mountains.

[*Mr. D. R. Williams*—wherein and how did I say so?]

Mr. G. W. Campbell, the gentleman contended, that this was a war measure, that our seaport towns were defenceless, that the British navy, should it be adopted, would lay them in ashes.

[*Mr. D. R. Williams*—the gentleman must be mistaken.]

Mr. G. W. Campbell—I have so taken the gentleman's words in my notes; in taking which I am seldom incorrect; but the gentleman has a right to explain his own expressions. He certainly did appear to consider this a war measure, and said our towns were exposed,—that thousands of innocent persons would be ruined by it—that Great Britain was fighting our battles.

[*Mr. D. R. Williams*—the gentleman has certainly mistaken me, it must be some other gentleman who said so.]

Mr. G. W. Campbell. I am glad that the gentleman disavows such sentiments. I wish every gentleman in the House would do the same. We are, however, further told, that this war, (which it seems is certainly to take place) is to be supported by the agricultural interest, and that the merchants in the large seaport towns will reap all the benefit. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those, who are for securing the seaport towns, at the expense of agriculture. But as I have already stated my ideas, on this point, I will not now repeat them. I do, however, believe the measure we propose to take, will, in the first instance, affect the commercial interest, and will only be felt by the agricultural interest in consequence of, and in proportion to the impression it makes on commerce.

Our commerce, sir, is more vulnerable than any other portion of our possessions,—it may be considered as encompassing our country, constituting its weak parts, and exposed to the first attacks of an enemy. Every impulse that is given, will be first felt by commerce, and through its medium by every other occupation in society.

But it is said, that this nation, on a former occasion experienced the robberies of Great Britain, without resorting to such a measure as this. That case when examined, will not justify the declaration. On that occasion the Representatives of the nation took a stronger ground than that before you. A bill passed this House interdicting all intercourse with Great Britain, and was rejected in the other House by a single vote, that of the vice-president. But notwithstanding this, a still stronger ground was taken. An embargo was laid, which was only removed on the commencement of negociation. Can these proceedings be considered as grounds for our submitting at this time, to the injustice of G. Britain? Surely they cannot—and I hope this House will never sanction such an idea. A remark made by a gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Clark) on the subject of the impressment of our seamen, merits some notice. That gentleman stated, as an excuse, (as I understood it) for the conduct of G. Britain in this respect, the doctrine she insists on, "that a person once a subject, is always a subject of her government, and never can shake off his allegiance." This is a dangerous doctrine to be acknowledged on this floor—and its consequences might involve the best interests of your country, and the lives of a vast number of your citizens. Suppose it once established, and a war should take place between this country and G. Britain—she would consider such of your citizens as had been born in her dominions, as rebels against their country,—and when they fall into her hands, would put them to death, or otherwise punish them as such; instead of treating them as prisoners of war. Are gentlemen prepared to admit a doctrine that would produce such dangerous consequences? I trust not. It is true G. Britain has contended for this right—but it never has been sanctioned by this government, and she has been obliged to relinquish it in part, by the decision of her courts of justice, so far as related to persons in this country, at the conclusion of peace with that nation. In reason, it can have no foundation, except during the time such subject may remain without becoming a citizen of another government, according to the laws thereof. It never ought, or can, be admitted as applying to persons in this country, after they have become citizens of the U. States, according to our laws. We are then bound to protect them as such.

To conclude my remarks on this subject, I will briefly repeat, that I am decidedly of opinion, the conduct of G. Britain, is such in impressing our seamen, and capturing our merchant vessels, on the ground of their being engaged in a trade with her enemies, not open to them in time of peace, is manifestly unjust and unauthorised by the laws of nations. I conceive we have an undoubted right, without giving just cause of war, to regulate our own commerce, and to say from what nations we will or will not import articles of consumption—and of what description, and under what circumstances. I also believe it our duty at this time to adopt some decisive measure on the subject, that will evince to Great Britain, our determination to resist aggression and to maintain our rights. I would, sir, prefer a measure, in which, we could, and would persevere, unless it should be found our interest to change it. A measure that would be least likely to paralize our revenue or affect the agricultural interest. With this view, I would prefer, in the first instance, imposing additional, or discriminating duties on certain specified articles, imported from G. Britain; such as would give the preference to other European markets. Or if more agreeable to the majority of this House, I would concur in interdicting the *importation* of such articles. And if this should not prove effectual—I would take still stronger ground. I would prohibit the importation of all merchandize, the growth or manufacture of the British dominions. And should it become